

ISSUES REGARDING HOUSE BILL 4531

According to **15 USC § 2, monopoly of a trade is a felony**. Here, on and for the record, I am making it known that I do not support monopoly of a trade. The following is of concern:

1. First, House Bill 4531 ("HB4531" or "Bill") does not state from where it derives the authority and standing in law to claim the title "Naturopathic Doctor" and "Doctor of Naturopathy" exclusively to one group of people and none other, and then to further set forth new definitions of terms and titles.

I ask: where is the proof that HB4531 has the authority, and supporting law, to lay claim to titles, specifically "Naturopathic Doctor" and "Doctor of Naturopathy"? If it has no such authority to lay such claim why are we even here?

On what lawful basis can NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS via HB4531 and only it lay claim to said titles and *restrain all others in the process*? As intensely as it may be desired, there is no ground in law for this.

2. Second, HB4531 does not state from where it derives the authority to *restrain all others* from using the titles and descriptions of naturopathic doctor and doctor of naturopathy.

I ask: where is the legal and lawful support for the idea that *only* the NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS, or any other exclusive group for that matter (such as group of engineers, mechanics, or other tradesman), can use the said titles and in the process restrain all others? And by restraining words/titles and restraining the use of words/titles, which this Bill does, is the Bill restraining commerce and restraining others through domination and monopoly over the use of the word/titles?

It appears to me that there is no lawful authority for the restriction of the term and that HB4531 seeks to create a monopoly on a trade. This is of great concern to me.

3. Third, **HB4531 is set to re-write history**: with this Bill the term Naturopathic Doctor (ND) becomes a title and the use of "Naturopathic" is not an adjective. Then further, the Bill creates its own definition of Naturopathic Doctor which by such definition conflicts with the historical meaning and definition of naturopathy. The table is set for the term Naturopathic Doctor to be further altered and adulterated to the point where a Naturopathic Doctor is not one who practices naturopathy. The historical use of the term becomes obsolete to the current definition and in essence history will be re-written.
4. Fourth, this Bill creates an *unlawful restraint*, gives power to a select group of people, and creates a slippery slope with no definitive end: It appears to me that by laying claim over the exclusive use of the title "Naturopathic Doctor" and "Doctor of Naturopathy", that this Bill creates a monopoly, specifically a monopoly over the trade and practice of naturopathic doctors. Thereby, people like me and other professionals would be *restrained* from using the term naturopathic doctor; and I am left wondering *how would such restraint be enforced*? If history is any guide, would it take the form of intimidation, fines, imprisonment? I do not understand how an action/Bill that creates a monopoly of trade, a monopoly upon the use of said titles and restraint upon all others, however well-intentioned, could possibly be lawful and sound public policy.